

Remarks

Claims 1-22, 25 and 36-39 are canceled herein. Claims 23-24, 26-27 and 31-34 are amended herein. Claims 40-63 are new herein. Claims 23-24, 26-35 and 40-63 remain pending in the Application.

Rejection under 103(a)

Claims 1, 4-6, 10, 12, 13, 15-20, 22-24, 32-33, 36 and 39

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 4-6, 10, 12, 13, 15-20, 22-24, 32-33, 36 and 39 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Antur et al. (6243815 B1) in view of Boswell, Jr. et al. (6,272,169). Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention is not rendered obvious over Antur et al. in view of Boswell, Jr. et al. for the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully states that Claims 1, 4-6, 10, 12, 13, 15-20, 22 and 36-39 are canceled herein. Therefore, the rejection with respect to Claims 1, 4-6, 10, 12, 13, 15-20, 22 and 36-39 is moot.

Claim 26 has been amended herein to include Claim 22 and all the limitations of Claim 26 and the intervening Claim 25. As the Examiner has stated, Claim 26 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base Claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base Claim and any intervening Claims.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 26 now in condition for allowance as pending from an allowable Claim re-written in Independent form including all of the limitations of the base Claim and any intervening Claims. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that Claims 23-24, 27 and 31-34 which are dependent on now allowable Independent Claim 26 are allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

New Independent Claim 40 includes previous Claim 27 and all the limitations of previous Claim 22 and the intervening Claim 25. As the Examiner has stated, Claim 40 (e.g. Claim 27) is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base Claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base Claim and any intervening Claims.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 40 is now in condition for allowance as pending from an allowable Claim re-written in Independent form including all of the limitations of the base Claim and any intervening Claims. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that Claims 41-51, which are based on the previous claim set associated with the allowable matter of Claim 27, depend on allowable Claim 40 and are allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

New Independent Claim 52 includes previous Claim 35 and all the limitations of previous Claim 22 and the intervening Claim 34. As the Examiner has stated, Claim 52 (e.g., Claim 35) is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base Claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base Claim and any intervening Claims.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 52 is now in condition for allowance as pending from an allowable Claim re-written in Independent form including all of the limitations of the base Claim and any intervening Claims. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that Claims 53-63, which are based on the previous claim set associated with the allowable matter of Claim 34, depend on allowable Claim 52 and are allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

Claims 3 and 7

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 3 and 7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Antur et al. (6243815 B1) in view of Boswell,

Jr. et al. (6,272,169) and further in view of Servi (5,278,904). Applicant respectfully states that Claims 3 and 7 are canceled herein. Therefore, the rejection with respect to Claims 3 and 7 is moot.

Claim 14

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 14 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Antur et al. (6243815 B1) in view of Boswell, Jr. et al. (6,272,169) and further in view of Dempsey et al. (5,826,048). Applicant respectfully states that Claim 14 is canceled herein. Therefore, the rejection with respect to Claim 14 is moot.

Claim 37

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 37 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Antur et al. (6243815 B1) in view of Boswell, Jr. et al. (6,272,169) and further in view of Fisher (5,475,826). Applicant respectfully states that Claim 37 is canceled herein. Therefore, the rejection with respect to Claim 37 is moot.

Claim 38

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 38 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Antur et al. (6243815 B1) in view of Boswell, Jr. et al. (6,272,169) and further in view of Servi (5,278,904). Applicant respectfully states that Claim 38 is canceled herein. Therefore, the rejection with respect to Claim 38 is moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the allowable subject matter of Claims 26-31 and 35 if rewritten in Independent form to include all of the limitations of the base Claim and any intervening Claims. As stated herein, Applicant has rewritten Claims 26, 27 and 35 in independent form including all of

the limitations of the base claim and any intervening Claims. In addition, Applicant has rewritten the Claim sets associated with 26, 27 and 35 to provide the proper claim dependency.

Conclusion


In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests issuance of the now allowable Claims 23-24, 26-35 and 40-63.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: _____

8/15/05



John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060